



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/834,856      | 04/12/2001  | Adam D. Sah          | 004055.P008         | 5570             |

26874 7590 12/19/2005

FROST BROWN TODD, LLC  
2200 PNC CENTER  
201 E. FIFTH STREET  
CINCINNATI, OH 45202

|          |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

CZEKAJ, DAVID J

|          |              |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2616

DATE MAILED: 12/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/834,856

Applicant(s)

SAH, ADAM D.

Examiner

Dave Czekaj

Art Unit

2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 August 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 23-28, 30-37, 39-41 and 43-49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 23-28, 30-37, 39-41, and 43-49 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/8, 11/7</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

Upon a further review/consideration, the objections previously applied have been withdrawn and a new rejection is set forth below.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 24-25, 28, 31-33, 37, 39-40, 43-45, and 47-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaguchi et al. (6400392), (hereinafter referred to as "Yamaguchi").

Regarding claims 31-32, 39, 43-45, and 48-49 Yamaguchi discloses an apparatus that relates to a video transmitting apparatus (Yamaguchi: column 1, lines 9-12). This apparatus comprises "sending the image to the user's system" (Yamaguchi: figure 5, column 5, lines 50-67, wherein the input part sends the image, the user's system is the output part), "refreshing the image periodically" (Yamaguchi: column 5, lines 50-67, wherein the refreshing is the continuous monitoring and sending of the image to the system), "determining whether to degrade the image comprises whether the user is active or inactive" (Yamaguchi: column 15, lines 1-15, wherein the active or inactive determination is whether the user's attention is directed toward a window making the user active),

"determining whether the user is active or inactive comprises determining whether a window displaying the image is fully visible to the user" (Yamaguchi: column 15, lines 1-15, wherein if the user's attention is directed toward the window, the window is fully visible to the user; if the user's attention is not directed towards the window, the window is not fully visible to the user), "degrading the image in response to a determination that the user is inactive" (Yamaguchi: column 15, lines 1-15, wherein the inactivity is the user not focusing attention towards a window, the degrading is the decrease in resolution or brightness), and "sending the degraded image to the user's system" (Yamaguchi: figure 5, wherein the user's system is the output part). Although Yamaguchi fails to disclose the term "degrade" as claimed, Yamaguchi does disclose a type of degrading in decreasing the resolution of the video. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement degrading in order to obtain an apparatus that operates more efficiently by reducing the bandwidth needed to transmit video/images over a network.

Regarding claim 24, Yamaguchi discloses "degrading the image comprises decreasing resolution of the image" (Yamaguchi: column 15, lines 10-14).

Regarding claim 25, Yamaguchi discloses "determining whether the user is active comprises determining whether a certain period of time has elapsed"

(Yamaguchi: column 17, lines 9-11, wherein the period of time is the window attention time interval).

Regarding claim 28, Yamaguchi discloses "the time is measured with a timer or counter" (Yamaguchi: figure 1, wherein the timers or counters is the CPU).

Regarding claims 33 and 40, Yamaguchi discloses "increasing the quality of the degraded image upon a determination that the user is active" (Yamaguchi: column 15, lines 10-15, wherein the activity is the user direction attention to a specific window, increasing the quality is increasing the resolution).

Regarding claim 37, Yamaguchi discloses "receiving a user request to increase the quality of the degraded image" (Yamaguchi: column 15, lines 4-15, wherein the user request is the user specifying attention to a particular window, the increase in quality is the increase in resolution).

Regarding claim 47, although not disclosed, it would have been obvious to capture the image located remotely from the user (Official Notice). Doing so would have been obvious in order to make the system more versatile by being able to operate the system in remote locations.

3. Claims 26-27, 30, 34-36, and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaguchi et al. (6400392), (hereinafter referred to as "Yamaguchi") in view of Atick et al. (6111517), (hereinafter referred to as "Atick").

Regarding claims 26-27, note the examiners rejection for claim 22, and in addition, claim 22 differs from claims 26-27 in that claims 26-27 further require

the period of time to being when the image was last refreshed and sent to the user's system. Atick teaches that prior art control systems suffer from several drawbacks such as only restricting initial access to a system (Atick: column 1, lines 32-35). To help alleviate this problem, Atick discloses "the time begins when the image was last refreshed and sent to the user's system" (Atick: column 7, lines 56-67, wherein the refreshing is the continuous monitoring and sending of the image to the user's system or computer). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the apparatus disclosed by Yamaguchi and add the timer periods taught by Atick in order to better regulate access of critical systems.

Regarding claims 30 and 46, Atick discloses "determining whether the user is using the user's system" (Atick: column 5, lines 38-41, wherein using the system is sitting down or being within the field of view of the computer).

Regarding claim 34, Atick discloses "the step of refreshing is performed more frequently than step of determining whether to degrade" (Atick: figure 5, wherein if activity is present the image is sent a certain number of times to the computer, than no determination to degrade has happened thus making it less often).

Regarding claim 35, Atick discloses "determining whether to degrade occurs concurrently with a refresh cycle" (Atick: figures 3 and 5, wherein the degrading is the launching of the screen saver, the refresh cycle is the continual sending of the image to the computer).

Regarding claim 36, Atick discloses "the degraded image is sent to the user's system upon refresh" (Atick: column 7, lines 56-67, wherein the refreshing is the continuous monitoring and sending of the image to the system).

4. Claims 23 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaguchi et al. (6400392), (hereinafter referred to as "Yamaguchi") in view of Atick et al. (6111517), (hereinafter referred to as "Atick") in further view of Sankaranarayan et al (6799208), (hereinafter referred to as "Sankaranarayan").

Regarding claim 23, note the examiners rejection for claim 22, and in addition, claim 23 differs from claim 22 in that claim 23 further requires the degrading to reduce the size of the image. Sankaranarayan teaches that fallback can occur when displaying between systems having different resources (Sankaranarayan: column 17, lines 51-64). To help alleviate this problem, Sankaranarayan discloses "reducing the size of the image" (Sankaranarayan: column 17, lines 62-64, column 18, lines 1-17). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the apparatus disclosed by Atick and add the reduced size image taught by Sankaranarayan in order to obtain an apparatus that operates more efficiently by avoiding a fallback condition.

Regarding claim 41, Sankaranarayan discloses "the network is the internet" (Sankaranarayan: column 6, lines 50-52).


### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dave Czekaj whose telephone number is (571) 272-7327. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9 hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Groody can be reached on (571) 272-7950. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DJC

  
VU LE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER